

## **MINUTES OF MEETING: Friday 16 February 2018**

**Room 5.16, NZTA Offices, Majestic Centre, 100 Willis St, Wellington**

### **Attending**

- Gerry Dance, Principal Advisor, System Design & Delivery, NZTA
- Andrea Timings, Network Engineer, Hamilton City
- Tim Hughes, National Traffic and Safety Engineer, NZTA
- Simon Kennett, Senior Project Manager, System Design & Delivery, NZTA
- Glenn Bunting, Network Manager, Safety and Environment, NZTA
- Steve Dejong, Traffic Engineer, Christchurch City
- Paul Barker, Safe and Sustainable Transport Manager, Wellington
- Glen Koorey – representing IPENZ Transportation Group
- Susan Lilley, Transportation Planner, Dunedin City
- Richard Bean, Senior Engineer, NZTA
- Claire Graham, Senior Specialist – Walking and Cycling, AT
- Adam Beattie - Walking and Cycling, AT
- Nick Marshall, Senior Roding Engineer, Whangarei District
- Jodie Lawson, Sustainable Transport Team Leader, Rotorua Lakes
- Simon Cager, Senior Project Engineer, Hutt City
- Wayne Newman, RCA Forum Research & Guidelines Group

### **Apologies**

- Kathryn King, Walking & Cycling Manager, Auckland Transport
- Ina Stenzel, Principal Specialist – Walking and Cycling, AT
- Claire Sharland, Asset Manager Transportation, Taupo District
- Andy High, Senior Engineering Officer, Nelson City

## **A G E N D A**

**1. WELCOME, INTRODUCTIONS, APOLOGIES AND H&S BRIEFING**

**2. ACTIONS FROM PREVIOUS MEETINGS**

**3. UPDATES**

**4. DESIGN ISSUES**

**5. OTHER BUSINESS**

## **ACTIONS AND DECISIONS FROM THE MEETING**

1. Actions from 3.5:
  - T. Hughes – follow up on work done on bollards and report to next meeting;
  - G. Koorey – follow up on work done by ViaStrada on Riley and Safe Hit posts and report to next meeting;
  - Everyone – send local photos of separators, any case studies or local experiences to G. Koorey.
2. Action from 3.6:
  - G. Dance and S. Kennett – ensure best practice in local innovations has been adopted as national best practice for NZ in time to inform Austroads revision of pedestrian/cycling guidance.
3. Actions from 4.a:
  - S. Kennett and T. Hughes – assemble guidance on minimum discernable heights and trip hazards from the local and foreign research, and legislation such as the Building Act;
  - C. Graham - do further work on trial heights and profiles for Copenhagen kerbs and report back to the group.
4. Action from 4.b:
  - C. Graham – investigate the potential adaptation and application of a low thermoplastic guidance strip to provide detectable delineation on a shared path and report to next meeting.
5. Action from 4.c:
  - G. Dance and S. Kennett – review guidance for adequacy of minimum widths and turning radii for wider and longer cycles and devices using cycling infrastructure.
6. Actions from 4.e:
  - S. Kennett - draft a paper for TCD Steering Group recommending use of apple green for lanes used by both buses and cyclists, and red for lanes not available to cyclists;
  - G. Dance – address recommended colours in CNG and approved specifications.
7. Actions from 4.f:
  - S. Kennett and G. Dance - clarify within the TCD Guidance for the M-2 cycle symbol to be marked off-centre in the cycle lane and placed nearer the outer edge of the lane to ensure virtual buffer lane is effective.
8. Action from 5.b:
  - W. Newman – edit the terms of reference to emphasise that members represent those with responsibility for the delivery of infrastructure for active modes and have a role to bring any issue related to this to the group.
9. Action from 5.c:
  - G. Dance – confirm the Wellington venue for 10 May and liaise with Palmerston North and Hastings regarding later meetings.

## **DECISIONS**

1. A waste collection vehicle cannot display a RG-24 sign. The preferred sign is a combination of the M-2 cycle symbol with a variant of RD-6R to indicate cyclists should pass safely to the right.
2. Having the waste collection truck routinely block the cycleway by straddling the separator while collecting is agreed to be best practice.
3. Where an advanced warning of a road crossing is considered necessary, an approved sign should be used, such as the GW triangle, to provide such warning.
4. The appropriate width for a ‘virtual buffer’ beside the parking lane alongside a cycle lane is one third of the cycling lane width. This creates a consequential need for the M-2 cycle symbol to be marked off-centre in the cycle lane and placed nearer the outer edge of the lane.
5. AMIG supports the principle of mandatory side detection and protection being required for heavy vehicles in New Zealand.

## **1. WELCOME, INTRODUCTIONS, APOLOGIES AND H&S BRIEFING**

Members new to the group were welcomed and a round-table introduction of each member was made. Apologies were recorded and Gerry Dance provided the H&S briefing for the meeting and explained the programme for the day. Steve Dejong reported that Nilesh Redekar had resumed a position with Christchurch City Council and would not be representing Hastings District Council on the group.

## **2. ACTIONS FROM PREVIOUS MEETINGS**

Actions from 6 July 2017 and recorded as Open at 16 October 2017:

1. Regulatory supplementary sign 'To Cyclists' to be progressed: Richard Bean confirmed this is being currently progressed.
2. A case study of the key attributes for separators will be developed: taken under 3.5.
3. The effect of hook-turn signs will be monitored at another site: taken under 3.4.
4. A case study on Bridge St Hook Turn sign to be supplied: remains open.
5. A case study on bus stop design on separated cycle routes will be supplied: Paul Barker and Simon Kennet confirmed that a case study on the Victoria Street bus stop design has been provided for CNG.
6. A trial of different crossing markings is to be developed: Simon Kennett reported that the driveway crossings markings trial had been very successful in showing the green blocks to be effective for traffic crossing into the carriageway and further work is being done to confirm the value for traffic crossing from the carriageway and checking for contraflow cyclists.
7. A Rule change to define a shared path will be progressed: Simon Kennett confirmed that a definition of a shared path is one of the matters expected to be included in the next Omnibus Rule amendments, likely to be in October/November 2018.
8. An application is to be made to TCDSG to use symbol in place of "cyclists" on "watch for traffic" sign: Steve Dejong confirmed this had been done.
9. Incident/accident trend developing with new infrastructure to be monitored and reported to next meeting: Steve Dejong reported that experienced users appear to be entering new infrastructure at excessive speeds and serious accidents have occurred on the tourist tram tracks; Glen Koorey is doing work on this to quantify the scale or extent of the problem in order to understand the potential responses most likely to be effective; Adam Beattie noted that tram tracks cause serious problems for cyclists around the world; Steve Dejong noted that cyclists are also falling coming off separators, especially in the rain.
10. Progress of shared-path 2-aspect signal trials to be reported to the first meeting in 2018: Richard Bean confirmed that permission has been given for trials to proceed; trials have been approved in Auckland and Christchurch, and Wellington may be added.
11. Update for next meeting on Paxster trial in Hamilton: taken under 3.8.
12. Update on school zone marking research: remains open.

### **Actions from 16 October 2017:**

1. Cyclists and Waste Collection – Action: S. Dejong to contact operator using RG-24 sign on a waste collection vehicle in Christchurch and provide details for him to get in touch with S. Kennett to discuss feasibility of an appropriate active warning sign for collection vehicles: taken under 4.d.
2. Separator selection – Action: G. Koorey to report back to the group on work ViaStrada is doing on separators to next meeting: taken under 3.5.
3. Levels of service for cycle path pavements - Action: S. Kennett to seek further input from Martin Gribble and REG on proposed draft specifications for pavement levels of

service for pavements used for cycling, on what further work might be needed to align these with the LoS work being done by REG and whether every cycling facility would have the same pavement level of service and, if not, how the different levels would be defined and determined: Simon Kennett reported that the work related only to pavement specifications and did not address levels of service.

4. Cycling contraflow advisory sign - Action: S. Kennett to recommend the agreed design for a contraflow cycling advisory sign to the TCD Steering Group: Simon Kennett confirmed that this had been progressed.
5. Bollards on cycle ways - Action: K. Fleckney to refine the draft guidance document for consideration at the next meeting: this action remains open.
6. Hold-rail and waiting-bay for cyclists before narrow rural bridges - Action: S. Kennett to report back to next meeting on proposed hold rail and green-marked waiting zone: taken under 4.h.
7. Next meeting - Action: W. Newman, G. Dance, N. Redekar to liaise on a possible date and venue, and inspection tour itinerary, for a meeting over two days in Hastings in mid-February: taken under 5.c.

### **3. UPDATES**

#### **1. Footpath cycling amendment**

Simon Kennett noted that there has been no change to who is able legally to ride on the footpath. It remains persons of any age on wheels less than 355mm, postees or persons delivering papers or circulars. The Transport and Industrial Relations select committee recommended that the law allow cycling on the footpath by children up to and including 12 years of age or year 8 (and accompanying adults), seniors over 65, and vulnerable users (such as those with mental or physical disabilities); make bells mandatory for any bicycles used on footpaths or shared use paths; and allow local authorities to exclude, on a reasonable basis, certain areas of footpath from being used for cycling. The status quo remains an option as a result of any policy investigation of the recommendations.

#### **2. RUR changes, timing and whether any priorities have changed**

Simon Kennett reported that the next cycling rules package is unlikely to be before 2019, but changes that it is hoped can be included in an Omnibus rule change in October/November 2018 include the definition of a shared path, a new "Watch for Traffic" sign, changes to the helmet rule and an increase in required cycle headlight visibility from 100m to 200m.

#### **3. Cycle Directional Signals Trial**

Steve Dejong reported that the interim evaluations (i.e. 3 months after installation) at High / Madras / St Asaph Streets are underway, with 127 cycle movements from before the installation, and 235 from after being analysed. The video data show that cyclist behaviour has improved since the directional cycle signals were installed. During the same video period, 24 red-light running motorists were observed on St Asaph Street before the directional cycle signals were installed, but only 17 were observed after the installation; given there was a longer amount of "after" footage reviewed, this suggests that motorist compliance has also improved with the installation of the directional cycle signals.

Also, 43 intercept surveys of cyclists were undertaken (surveyors found most cyclists were in a hurry and didn't want to stop, but they did manage to pass out cards to inform people of the online survey). The online survey is open to all people (regardless of what mode(s) of transport they use and whether they're familiar with the site). So far, over 100 responses have been received; the survey will close on Monday 19 February and analysis of the responses will

ensue. The interim report for this site will be provided to the TCD steering committee by the end of February.

Auckland Transport has installed the directional cycle signals at the Beach Road site, as well as at the Nelson / Victoria Streets site, although these latter are not yet operational. Construction is continuing on the 2<sup>nd</sup> Christchurch site - Antigua / St Asaph Streets, which is programmed to be completed by June 2018.

#### 4. Hook Turn sign

Steve Dejong explained that the origin of this sign was the poor visibility of the hook turn box on the carriageway in many instances. There is some evidence to suggest that the sign itself has poor visibility for cyclists, being above their natural sight lines. Using a pavement marking instead, however, would instruct all cyclists to make a hook turn to the right, regardless of whether they wished to proceed straight ahead or turn left. A thermoplastic overlay might be an option, or failing that, using directional signals. An advisory thermoplastic overlay with appropriate skid resistance will be investigated.

Finding an appropriate location for an effective trial of new devices remains challenging in Christchurch as the rebuild continues.

In response to a question from Glen Connolly, Steve noted that the hook turn neither improves nor detracts from the efficiency of the intersection.

#### 5. CNG cycleway separator design guidance

Glen Koorey spoke to the draft guidance note and selection matrix circulated prior to the meeting. The latter is designed to facilitate the choice of separator most appropriate to the characteristics of a location. Now that the draft has been presented, feedback is being sought.

In the discussion of the draft guidance note and matrix, the meeting noted that, while the guide does offer a full range of options for national needs, the result seems to be an increasing variety of shapes, sizes and colours. At this point we should be seeing a move from temporary and retrofitted separators to permanent, planned and integrated separation. For new-builds especially, separators should be integral to the design.

Councils are finding that digging up the road surface and building the separator as a kerb, able to be truck-mounted, is as cheap as installing some temporary separators.

Separators are not without problems. Pedestrians are taking time to get used to Copenhagen-style double kerbs and tripping on them in Christchurch. There is also a need for more care around end-treatments. Elsewhere, there is a problem with separators causing damage to the underside of vehicles being driven over them. In many cases it is the reaction to the aesthetics of separators that sustains "bikelash" in local communities.

There has been work done on the types of bollard being used around the country.

#### Actions:

T. Hughes - follow up on work done on bollards and report to next meeting;

G. Koorey - follow up on work done by ViaStrada on Riley and Safe Hit posts and report to next meeting;

Everyone - send local photos of separators, any case studies or local experiences to

G. Koorey.

## 6. Walk/cycle industry training

Simon Kennett presented a summary of work done on attitudes to training by Abley/ViaStrada. Using a 0-3 rating for interest and also for preferences, the survey found that the greatest interest was in “mode neutral” or all-modes design, followed by intersection design for cycling. There was strong interest in free training, but free webinar training in particular. A couple of hours on a specific technical issue, or a group exercise on a case study or a day course on fundamentals were seen as appropriate lengths.

Gaps that were observed include increasing the demand for training on delivering “liveability” or understanding the full effects of what is being done, not merely meeting technical specifications. The other gap is pedestrian needs, especially on what is needed to get the provision for pedestrians up to the levels being provided for cycling. Some research is being done on this currently.

It was noted that Austroads is looking to revise the pedestrian/cycling guidance later this year, but while NZ has jurisdictional guidance, much of the best practice has been occurring at the local levels (eg Christchurch and Auckland) and this needs to be recognized at a national level quite urgently to ensure NZ can take these innovations to Austroads.

### Action

Gerry Dance and Simon Kennett – ensure best practice in local innovations has been adopted as national best practice for NZ in time to inform Austroads revision of pedestrian/cycling guidance.

## 7. Cycling Levels of Service

Tim Hughes reported on the lack of research on public perceptions of levels of service and at what point a level of service ceases to be acceptable. At the moment most assessing is done by “educated best guess”. Research was being done 15 years ago, but there was a shift in priorities and loss of momentum, and it has only recently begun again.

Using the Opus research bike (with the camera set at chest height), 10 routes were ridden in Auckland and Christchurch at different times of the day, giving video for 55 mid-block and 21 intersections. The video was shown to audiences, viewing 10 each, and data were collected on the cycling experience of the viewers.

The results produced some surprises: while those who actually rode the routes rated consistently regardless of experience, those watching the video tended to rate at a lesser LoS and to rate it lower proportionate to lack of experience. Those watching the videos also seem to have rated the route at a higher LoS based on the adjacent presence of more heavy vehicle traffic, which appears counter-intuitive.

Nevertheless, data can now support determining a LoS for planning infrastructure and it is possible now to accurately predict a perceived LoS by users and people using adjacent infrastructure. Planners can understand what LoS will be an attractant and what will be a deterrent to use and better direct investment to getting increased use.

## 8. Paxster survey

Andrea Timings reported that NZ Post have been using the Paxster vehicles in Hamilton since September. HCC has so far completed two sets of footpath user counts, with a third to happen in February 2018 and a fourth in September 2018. While it is difficult to make any definitive finding from only two sets of data, so far nothing has arisen that has given cause for concern.

In November/December 2017 HCC ran a customer survey asking for community views and feedback on the new Paxster vehicles. The survey was developed in collaboration with NZ Post and local advocacy groups. Key statistics from the survey:

- 247 responses, 245 from Hamilton residents;
- 95% have not noticed any change to the condition of kerbs or grass verges since the trial began;
- 90% said the presence of Paxsters on the footpath had not changed how they used the footpath (e.g. time of travel, route taken, feeling of safety);
- 10% said it had changed how they used the footpath;
- 66% rated Paxster drivers as considerate or very considerate towards pedestrians;
- 9% rated them as inconsiderate or very inconsiderate.

Paxter drivers are meant to acknowledge pedestrians with a warm hello when using the same space. With the Paxster being very quiet, this is very important. Paxsters are not allowed to operate around school zones and peak times during the day.

HCC will run the customer survey again in May 2018. Representatives from advocacy groups have not reported any major concerns since the Paxster introduction. Representatives from NZ Post operations, Hamilton City Transport and the Infrastructure Alliance were meeting weekly up until December 2017 to discuss any hazards, incidents or complaints. No major incidents have occurred involving other vehicles or footpath users. Frequency of meetings is now monthly.

#### 4. DESIGN ISSUES

**a. Copenhagen cycle path** – Minimum kerb heights and the kerb profile standards; surface material specification of asphalt if in NZ we don't have an asphalt paver narrow enough to be used on a 1.8m wide cycle path? Claire Graham explained that AT is interested in the kerb heights and profiles being used elsewhere. AT prefers a 65mm kerb with a 1:3 slope to have a distinguishable kerb for visually impaired pedestrians.

Tim Hughes noted that research done previously has established that the visually impaired can distinguish a 1:8 slope, but any surface change less than 60mm can be a trip hazard. Steve Dejong reported that CCC uses 50mm and people do find the double kerb confusing until they become used to it. Two points need to be considered in selecting an appropriate kerb height: local metrology and provision for storm water; and the needs of delivery vehicles, buses and trucks. While a mountable kerb has its attractions, it facilitates vehicles parking in the lane and poses a greater risk for cyclists, especially in the rain.

Simon Kennett noted that the kerb design will need to consider the needs of other legal pedestrians, such as mobility scooter or kick scooter users. These are likely to need an easier slope than 1:2; while 1:3 is possible, it might need to be less than 60mm. It was agreed that guidance on this needs to be assembled from the local and foreign research, and legislation, such as the Building Act, to understand minimum discernable heights and trip hazards. AT will do further work on trial heights and profiles and report back to the group.

#### Actions

Simon Kennett and Tim Hughes – assemble guidance on minimum discernable heights and trip hazards from the local and foreign research, and legislation such as the Building Act;

Claire Graham - do further work on trial heights and profiles for Copenhagen kerbs and report back to the group.

**b. Shared cycle path and footpath** - Delineation between paths that is detectable by visually impaired pedestrians without creating a trip hazard in situations where the ability to provide height separation is absent. Claire Graham reported on the background to work being done by AT, noting the use in London of a 150mm wide and 20mm high concrete insert into shared paths and of a 150mm wide and 6mm high thermoplastic strip in Seattle.

It was noted that the issue of introducing a trip hazard into the path was identical to that already discussed for Copenhagen kerbs and it was debated whether any vertical element was needed at all, as the visually impaired can generally discern a material change, whether by a dark/light distinction or an audible change to the surface. A thermoplastic guidance line might be employed, but this might very easily be an application of the existing “rumble strip” technology.

Action:

Claire Graham – investigate the potential adaptation and application of a low thermoplastic guidance strip to provide detectable delineation on a shared path and report to next meeting.

**c. Cargo bikes** – Is guidance on infrastructure width consideration needed or not? Claire Graham raised this question, noting that at some key points (eg Quay St) the presence of a cargo bike requires other users to pause.

The discussion noted that width is likely to be less a determinant of the ability of wider or longer bikes, trikes or other mobility devices to use a path than the radii provided for turning. This can be no less than 2.5m for a tandem, for example. This will become a critical consideration for the design of mazes. Paul Barker noted that the effect of crossfall on trikes or devices with two front wheels is also not widely understood or designed for.

Action:

Gerry Dance and Simon Kennett – review guidance for adequacy of minimum widths and turning radii for wider and longer cycles and devices using cycling infrastructure.

**d. Waste collection and separated cycle infrastructure** – Issues and responses.

Simon Kennett provided an update on this issue. Cyclists are passing the waste collection vehicles on the left and the vehicles have taken to displaying an RG-24 cycling prohibited sign at the rear.

It was agreed that a waste collection vehicle cannot display a RG-24 sign.

A more positive message should be used. The preferred sign would be a combination of cycle symbol with variant of RD-6R to indicate cyclists should pass safely to the right. Having the waste collection truck routinely block the cycleway by straddling the separator was agreed to be best practice.

It was noted that some cycleways have sections without gaps that can extend up to 600m, but that it would be unlikely that these would have rubbish bins being placed by them, while the presence of rubbish bins would normally mean that driveways would equally be present. Poor design sees bins placed out of reach of the collector or returned into the cycle lanes.

**e. Bus Lane Colour** - Use different colours: apple green for cycle lanes and emerald green for bus lanes?

Steve Dejong explained the background to this question arose simply from the differing



colour specifications, however, it was noted that inexperienced cyclists were coming into strife by following “the green” and riding into “BUS ONLY” lanes that are still marked in green.

Richard Bean suggested that marking a lane where cyclists cannot ride (e.g. Bus Only lanes) with red would seem a more sensible colour choice, while it would appear sensible to mark any lane where a cyclist can ride (e.g. Bus and Cycle lanes) in apple green.

Action:

S. Kennett - draft paper for TCD Steering Group recommending use of apple green for lanes used by both buses and cyclists, and red for lanes not available to cyclists;

G. Dance – address recommended colours in CNG and approved specifications.

#### **f. Marking for cycle paths**

- (i) advance warning of intersections?

Simon Kennett presented a proposed marking giving advanced warning of a road crossing. The discussion remarked on the number of unnecessary markings, noting that cycle, pedestrian and directional arrows should not need to be used at the end of any section of a two-way shared path. If an advanced warning is considered necessary, it was agreed that an approved sign should be used as the marking. Better placement of the GW triangle could provide such warning. The presence of the sign and the markings was considered unnecessary clutter, and the lack of a grab rail beside the intersection was remarked upon.

- (ii) width of virtual buffers

Simon Kennett sought clarification on the appropriate width for a ‘virtual buffer’ beside the parking lane alongside a cycle lane. It was agreed that the buffer should be one third of the cycling lane width. This creates a consequential need for clarification within the TCD Guidance for the cycle symbol to be marked off-centre in the lane and placed nearer the outer edge of the lane.

Action:

Simon Kennett and Gerry Dance - clarify within the TCD Guidance for the M-2 cycle symbol to be marked off-centre in the cycle lane and placed nearer the outer edge of the lane to ensure virtual buffer lane is effective.

#### **g. Shared Path Marking Guidance**

Simon Kennett presented a draft guidance note prepared by ViaStrada for signs and markings to designate paths for pedestrians and cyclists. This is intended to give guidance in place prior to any Rule change permitting use of markings instead of signs.

Discussion of the example used for a transition involving an on-road cycle lane (figure 4.1) concluded that the proposed signs would not be needed, duplicating the markings, but green tactile tiles would be needed at the approach to the cycle lane to guide visually impaired pedestrians safely to the off-road path.

For the example used for a transition involving a separated bi-directional cycleway (figure 5.1) it was agreed that the marking for the shared path should be of comparable scale to that for the cycleway or the restricted footpath and, therefore, a single centred marking should be used. Tactile tiles would be needed and, for a bi-directional cycleway without a centre line, arrows should be used to show that it is bi-directional near the access point. The same comments apply to the example for a transition to off-road paths (figure 5.2).

#### **h. Narrow-bridge hold-rail and active warning-signs**

Gerry Dance and Simon Kennett presented the progress on a trial for treatments at pinch points on rural roads, in particular at bridges that lack sufficient width for a safe shoulder for cyclists. This combines a green hold rail beside a green block marked at a safe waiting point before a bridge for relatively short bridges where good sight-lines are present with a new speed advisory sign to be used in locations where the bridge is too long or the sight-lines too short for a cyclist to safely cross between vehicles. This sign sets an advisory speed limit of 40 kmph “when cyclists present” and explains that it is for a “narrow bridge”.

The speed aligns with the present school zone advisory and is designed to indicate desired behaviour. While the trial will proceed with the proposed sign, it was agreed that it could use “narrow road” in appropriate circumstances.

#### **i. Advanced stop box buffer**

Simon Kennett presented additional research done on the visibility available from HV cabs in use in NZ. This found that a 1.84m tall HV driver needed to be stopped 3.5m behind a 1.8m tall cyclist if the cyclist’s seat post mounted light were to be clearly visible at night. An ASB of 4.5 - 5.0m with a buffer of 1.0 - 1.5m is proposed, with the green marked only on the forward 3.5m in the ASB and no white line marked until the limit line at the back of the buffer, to discourage vehicle encroachment. This would be recommended for high freight routes.

The discussion noted that cyclists and heavy vehicles interact wherever a heavy vehicle needs to use a road, whether servicing a suburban supermarket or hardware store, delivering building supplies to a construction site or for a house relocation. The proposed layout would necessitate the installation of new signal loops at most intersections.

It was agreed that a trial is needed to assess the effect of encroachment on the proposed ASB buffer, and of the buffer on encroachment. Paul Barker indicated an interest in undertaking this trial in Wellington.

### **5. OTHER BUSINESS**

#### **a. Mandatory side detection and protection for heavy vehicles**

Simon Kennett noted that there has been very little interest in progressing the recommendations of the Cycling Safety Review around improving safety features on heavy vehicles. MoT has found minimal benefit from the cost imposed on the road transport industry previously, but there is potential for this to change with the review of the Safer Journeys strategy.

The discussion noted the total failure of heavy vehicles to incorporate the safety features that have become standard in the light vehicle fleet, and referred back to the range of vehicles illustrated in the research reported under 4.i as providing obvious reasons for mandatory side detection and protection on these vehicles.

AMIG supports the principle of mandatory side detection and protection being required for heavy vehicles in New Zealand.

#### **b. AMIG terms of reference**

Gerry Dance presented the current terms of reference. It was agreed that these accurately reflect the current activities of the group, but that greater emphasis needs to be put on the role of each member in bringing issues to the table and on the representation in the group of those with the responsibility to manage the delivery of active modes infrastructure.

Action

Wayne Newman – edit the terms of reference to emphasise that members represent those with responsibility for the delivery of infrastructure for active modes and have a role to bring any issue related to this to the group.

**c. Meeting programme for 2018**

Gerry Dance proposed three further meetings for 2018, potentially in May, late July or early August, and November, with visits to Palmerston North and Hastings later in the year. The programme of meetings adopted for 2018 was:

- 10 May in Wellington
- 2 August in Palmerston North
- 21/22 November in Hastings

The last meeting of the year would combine a full-day meeting with a half-day inspection tour and involve an overnight stay for those doing both.

Action

Gerry Dance – confirm the Wellington venue for 10 May and liaise with Palmerston North and Hastings regarding later meetings.

**d. Dockless bike sharing**

Simon Kennett reported on the rapid increase in this phenomenon since it was last discussed, with dockless bike sharing schemes occurring in Auckland, Christchurch and Wellington. Overseas experience indicates that these schemes can contribute positively to public transport through the provision of mobility as a service, but in every case to do so effectively requires cooperation with local authorities, through invitation, regulation and control of transport provision and street trading.

Paul Barker noted that WCC had been approached and the schemes can offer fenced routes or destinations and incentives for relocation to meet demand, such as to the Railway Station for morning commuters. Nevertheless, there would be a significant vandalism risk; it was too easy to see the harbour adjacent to Te Papa starting to look like the canals of Amsterdam.

There was some discussion of the impediment to cycling currently posed by public transport, with very poor facilities for bike sharing being provided by rail and bus operators and the lack of secure storage for bikes at stations discouraging cyclists from using the trains.

**e. GPS 2018**

Gerry Dance noted that every local authority had now received a letter from the Hon. Phil Twyford regarding the GPS 2018 and that it places emphasis on a “transformation” of land transport. The need to consider all modes and to consider the effect on other modes in decisions accords closely with the approach that AMIG has identified as necessary in planning infrastructure for the active modes. This will be the norm now for all transport planning.

The meeting closed at 4.10.